III. REMARKS

"Fig. 2" has been deleted from the abstract. Thus it is no longer objectionable.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is confusing the concepts of "slot" and "burst". Concerning the three decisive features at the end of the applicant's pending claim 1, which require one data field of the burst to be filled with one kind of data symbols and another data field of the same burst to be filled with another kind of data symbols, the Examiner uses reference designators taken from Lucent's fig. 6. There we can clearly see how for each user there is a separate burst, having its own pilot symbols and own data symbols. The Examiner uses the reference designator 602 for a "burst"; according to column 9, line 14, the reference designator 602 designates a SYNC field. The author of the Lucent reference specifically uses the term "subslot" for what appears with reference designators 603-608 in Fig. 6. That is, in each subslot a separate, independent (if somewhat shortened) burst will be transmitted. This is not the same as in the applicant's pending independent claims, which literally require the use of two different kinds of data symbols to occur in a single burst.

Thus the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 102 on Lucent should be withdrawn.

Further, since there is not the slightest suggestion of these features in Lucent, claims 1 and 2 are unobvious over Lucent.

If the Examiner persists in this rejection, he is asked to show, where in the reference would one find a teaching of mixing two kinds of data symbols into a single burst.

In rejecting the receiver claims 15-17 the Examiner additionally cites Jones. However, one should immediately note that Jones's disclosure is limited to receiving uplink transmissions at the head end of a tree-like point-to-multipoint bi-directional transmission arrangement, which by definition excludes the received bursts from being combinations from different data sources. Each terminal device in a tree-like arrangement such as Jones's will definitely formulate bursts of its own, and this is not changed by the fact that the bursts arrive at the head-end in a tightly multiplexed manner.

Thus the rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 USC 102 on Jones should be withdrawn.

Further since there is no suggestion of the features of the present invention in Jones, these claims are unobvious over it.

Since the present inventive features are missing from Lucent and Jones, combining them does not result in the present invention. Thus the rejection of claims 8-9, 12 and 14 under 35 USC 103 on this combination of references should be withdrawn.

Similarly Ericsson and Menzel fail to show the present invention. Thus the rejection of claims 12 and 14 should be withdrawn.

New claims 19-27 correspond to the various allowable dependent claims re-written in independent form or claims dependent thereon. Thus they are allowable.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check in the amount of \$660.00 is enclosed for additional claim fees. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler Reg. No. 24,139

Perman & Green, LLP 425 Post Road Fairfield, CT 06824 (203) 259-1800 Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 7/9/04

Signature:

Person Making Deposit